

12810904

INSTRUCTIONS TO WESTERN UNION: PLEASE SEND THE FOLLOWING AS A NIGHT LETTER SO THAT IT IS RECEIVED BY CONGRESSMAN FOGARTY IN WASHINGTON ON TUESDAY MORNING, MARCH 6. DELIVER, DO NOT TELEPHONE THIS MESSAGE.

CONGRESSMAN JOHN E. FOGARTY
NEW HOUSE OFFICE BLDG., RM. 1235
WASHINGTON, D.C.

*
DEAR CONGRESSMAN FOGARTY: AT THE SUGGESTION OF MRS. ALBERT D. LASKER, I AIRMAILED TO YOU, SO THAT YOU SHOULD RECEIVE IT TUESDAY MORNING, MARCH 6, SOME * SUGGESTIONS FOR QUESTIONS WHICH MIGHT ELICIT ANSWERS WHICH WOULD BE MOST USEFUL IN HELPING US TO COMBAT ANY OPPOSITION PUBLICITY LATER ON, AGAINST INCREASES IN RESEARCH APPROPRIATIONS. IF THESE QUESTIONS AND THE ANSWERS BY GOVERNMENT WITNESSES COULD BECOME PART OF THE TESTIMONY, WE COULD QUOTE FROM SUCH PRINTED STATEMENTS WHEN WE ARE FACED WITH TRYING TO REFUTE POSSIBLE ANTAGONISTIC NEWSPAPER COMMENT AND EDITORIALS. I CAN BE REACHED AT 580 5TH AVE. NEW YORK CITY 36. TELEPHONE PLAZA 7- 2220. ALL SINCERE AND RESPECTFUL REGARDS.

RUTH R. MAIER

* (Material attached)

This will be taken
around
not special delivery
ps

QUESTIONS NEEDED IN CROSS-EXAMINING GOVERNMENT WITNESSES, TO ELICIT STATEMENTS WHICH WILL BECOME PART OF THE TESTIMONY, SO THAT WE MAY QUOTE FROM THESE PRINTED STATEMENTS, OUT OF THEIR OWN MOUTHS, WHEN WE ARE PRESSED TO REFUTE LATER NEWSPAPER COMMENTS, WHICH MAY OPPOSE INCREASED APPROPRIATIONS.

- I. Is it not a fact that it has been proven that benefits resulting from medical research--entirely apart from the humanitarian aspects--include an actual economic gain?
- II. Isn't it true that this is accomplished because lives saved and prolonged by new medical discoveries have reaped a vast income-tax gain for the Government, far in excess of the Government's spending on medical research?
- III. Is it not a fact that whatever your private opinion and belief may be in respect to the need for an expanded appropriation for medical research, that you cannot really give expression to this belief?
- IV. Is it not true that you are hindered from doing so in your position as a Government official--and that you feel that you are required to go along with the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, even if this falls short of your true belief?
- V. Is it not a fact that about 25% of the amount allocated to research projects by the National Institutes of Health is spent on training grants for research?
- VI. Isn't it a fact that in the original 1962 appropriations (before cut-backs) where research projects received \$433,662,000, training grants totaled \$118,506,000?

VII. ~~/~~ Is it not a fact that leading scientists, including Dr. Isidor S. Ravdin, Past President of the American College of Surgeons, and Dr. Sidney Farber, of the Harvard Medical School, have urged acceleration of research against cancer through increased NIH appropriations?

VIII. Is it not a fact that they have stated that any curtailment of medical research funds might seriously interfere with analysis and discovery of new chemical compounds being tested as possible anti-cancer agents? And is it not true that this same principle applies to research in heart disease, arthritis, blindness, mental illness and all the major diseases besetting the people of our country today?

IX. We sometimes hear it said that there is no room for more research programs, and that there are not enough trained manpower, and facilities, and that therefore we do not need enlarged appropriations.

Is it not a fact that, on the contrary, just because there are at present inadequate manpower and inadequate facilities, that extra funds are needed?

X. Is it not true that such funds are needed largely for the modernization and expansion of facilities, and for the training of a waiting list of people whose applications for training have been approved, but whose training cannot be carried out for lack of present funds?

XI. Is it not a fact that we also need increased funds for the creation of permanent positions, for already trained men who are seeking such jobs?

XII. Is it not a further fact that members of the Committee of Consultants on Medical Research testified to the above, stating, "The Committee disagrees emphatically with those who hold that further expansion of the medical research effort of the country is impossible because of shortage of manpower"?

Documentation of XII

[From the Committee's report, incorporated into the Labor-Health, Education and Welfare Appropriations For 1961 Hearings, before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, 86th Congress, Second Session H.R. 11390--Testimony of Committee of Consultants on Medical Research, Page 1467, under heading, "Manpower for Research". Also page 1389, testimony of Dr. Wittson; also testimony of Dr. Dempsey, pages 1406, 1407, 1408, and 1409; also testimony of Dr. Wilson, pages 1447, 1448, and 1449; also section on page 1346, under "Manpower For Research"--discussion between Dr. Farber and Senator Smith; also page 1347, statement of Mr. Jones on manpower for research; also on page 1360, testimony of Mr. Jones on need for funds for further recruitment of personnel; also page 1363, comment by Senator Hill re personnel and facilities; also pages 1433 and 1456, testimony by Dr. Farber; also page 1468; also pages 1475 and 1476.

Documentation of the need for additional facilities--which are still not fully met at present--occurs in the material from the Committee's report, and its testimony at the 1961 hearings as follows: on pages 1430 and 1431--testimony of Dr. Farber; on pages 1438, 1443 and 1446, testimony of Dr. De Bakey.]

XIII. Our opponents have said in speaking against us, (Evening Star editorial, Friday, December 1, 1961), "Perhaps it is not generally known, but it has not been unusual for the NIH to turn back to the Treasury money which it was unable for one reason or another to use. Last year, for example, some \$13,692,000 in appropriated money remained unspent because there were not enough research projects to be funded."

Is it not a fact that if the necessary research projects had been promptly set in motion, and if the training program had been accelerated, so as to provide enough personnel to run these projects, that the unspent appropriated money would have been used up? Actually, wouldn't the appropriation have fallen short of the requirements?

XIV. Is it not a fact that the delays in starting the programs-- amounting to as much as six months' delay--are actually what caused an apparent excess of funds? Isn't it true that if the programs really began promptly in June of each year, immediately on the heels of appropriations that had actually been voted by then, that there would be no balance of appropriated money left from such programs at the end of the year?

XV. Is it not a fact that the special advisory non-government committee of experts, comprised of both scientists and laymen--the Committee of Consultants on Medical Research--stated in a report, in May 1960, that even at that time, the cost of disease and disability to the nation was at least \$35 billion a year?

XVI. Did that committee not also state that only through medical research and training, and the applications of the findings thereof, could these losses be reduced?

XVII. Did not this committee project that, "by 1970 the total support of medical research of the United States will probably require the expenditure of \$3 billion, of which more than \$2 billion will in all likelihood come from the Federal government"?

I recall to you that this Committee was constituted in response to a resolution passed by the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate, "to determine whether the funds provided by the Government for research in dread diseases are sufficient and efficiently spent in the best interests of the research for which they were designated...and to take into consideration the impact....and that it arrived at its conclusions after a year of study, and hearing over 100 witnesses and authorities.

XVIII. You state that you are opposed to increased appropriations, and that the present appropriation is adequate. Is it not true that this ^{argument} ~~agreement~~ of "adequacy" was also advanced 15 years ago, when the appropriation for the National Institutes of Health was only \$2.5 million?

XIX. Is it not also true that each year Government officials have resisted increases in the appropriations, insisting that the appropriation of the previous year was adequate?-- And yet that that previous year's appropriation had been similarly resisted at that time, with the insistence that the appropriation of the year prior to that was adequate?

XX. In specific terms, is it not a fact that Government officials resisted the appropriation of \$560 million for the fiscal 1961 appropriation?

XXI. When appropriations for fiscal 1962 came up, is it not a fact that they then cited \$560 million as the figure for 1962, at the time when the Citizens Committee was recommending \$968 million for 1962?

XXII. Congress actually appropriated \$737 million for 1962 (which was later slashed by Secretary Ribicoff to \$677 million for 1962.) Now that the Citizens' recommendation is for \$1,126,566,000 for fiscal 1963, isn't it true that Government officials are now trying to stay in the vicinity of a \$780 million bracket, which is only slightly higher than the 1962 appropriation originally voted, against their resistance, last year?